<center>REMARKS</center>

Claims 1-56 were presented for examination. In a Final Office Action dated August 6, 2008, claims 1-56 were rejected. In response, claims 3-6, 10, 12-14, 16, 29-32, 36, 38-40, and 42 are amended herein. Claims 1-56 are pending upon entry of this amendment.

<center>**Response to Rejections Under 35 USC §103(a)**</center>

The Examiner rejected claims 1-6, 10-32, 36-52 and 54-56 under 35 USC §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Ryan, U.S. Patent No. 6,421,675, in view of Knight, U.S. Patent No. 6,571,234, and further in view of Ducatel, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2006/0136405. The Examiner rejected claims 7-9 and 33-35 under 35 USC §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Ryan, further in view of Knight and Ducatel and further in view of Zhou, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0059730. This rejection is traversed in view of the amended claims.

Claims 1 and 27 respectively recite a method and a computer-readable storage medium for ranking article identifiers of a result set from an implicit query implied from a user's current context. Claim 1 is representative.

> A method of ranking article identifiers of a result set from an implicit query implied from a user's current context, the method comprising:
> receiving an event concerning the user's current context, wherein the event comprises a user interaction with an article having content stored on a local client device, wherein the article is associated with at least one of a plurality of client applications;
> analyzing the content of the article **associated with the event concerning the user's current context** to extract at least one keyword;
> generating an implicit query based at least in part on the at least one keyword;
> performing a search based at least in part on the implicit query to determine a result set, wherein the result set comprises one or more article identifiers associated with articles relevant to the implicit query; and

ranking the article identifiers.

The claimed invention receives an event concerning the user's current context, wherein the event comprises a user interaction with an article having content stored on a local device. The content of the article associated with the event is analyzed to extract at least one keyword. Analyzing the content of the article associated with the event to extract at least one keyword is beneficial as this allows an implicit search query to be generated based at least in part on the keyword resulting in a result set that will comprise article identifiers relevant to the user at that particular time without the user having to explicitly enter a search query.

As noted by the Examiner, Ryan and Knight do not disclose or suggest "analyzing the content of the article associated with the event concerning the user's current context to extract at least one keyword." (Office Action, pg. 4.) Ryan merely discloses a method of updating an internet search engine database with the results of a user's selection of specific web page listings from a general web page listing provided to the user as a result of an initial keyword search entry. (Ryan, Abstract.) Knight merely discloses managing an online electronic message board. (Knight, Abstract.) Ducatel does not remedy the deficiencies of Ryan and Knight.

Ducatel discloses a system and method for improving database searching. (Ducatel, Abstract.) Ducatel discloses that a user-generated query is executed based on a keyword and in response to the execution the system returns a list of alternative keywords from which the user can select to refine the search query. (Ducatel, ¶ [0063].) To generate the alternative keywords, the system refers to a user profile that is populated with keywords that are extracted from a set of documents that reflect the user's interests. (Ducatel, ¶ [0066].) The

Examiner asserts that Ducatel's disclosure of extracting keywords from documents to build a user profile corresponds to the recited limitation. However, a close inspection of Ducatel, including the sections cited by the Examiner and elsewhere, indicates that this assertion is incorrect.

Ducatel discloses an offline process of extracting keywords from an article that is part of a set of documents that is used to build a user profile. (Ducatel, ¶¶ [0051], [0053], [0066] and [0068].) While Ducatel does disclose extracting a keyword from a document in general, Ducatel does not disclose extracting keywords from a document in which "a user interaction" occurred during "an event concerning the user's current context," as claimed. In Ducatel, the user has no interaction with the documents in which keywords are extracted and the documents do not concern the "user's current context," as claimed. In contrast, the claimed invention analyzes "the content of the article *associated with the event concerning the user's current context* to extract at least one keyword."

Claims 22 and 48 similarly recite "analyzing the content of the article associated with the event concerning the user's current context to extract at least one keyword from the event." All arguments advanced above with respect to claims 1 and 27 equally apply to claims 22 and 48. Thus, for at least these reasons, Applicants submit that claims 1, 22, 27 and 48 are patentable over Ryan, Knight and Ducatel, both alone and in combination.

The Examiner rejected claim 53 under 35 USC §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Ryan, further in view of Knight, Ducatel, and Zhou. This rejection is traversed.

Claim 53 recites a method of ranking article identifiers of a result set from an implicit query implied from a user's current context, the method comprising "analyzing the content of the file stored on the local client device to extract at least one keyword." Claim 53 is patentably distinguishable over Ryan, Knight and Ducatel for the reasons articulated above regarding claim 1.

Zhou does not remedy the deficiencies of Ryan, Knight and Ducatel. There is no hint, mention or suggestion in Zhou of "analyzing the content of the file stored on the local client device to extract at least one keyword," nor does the Examiner make this assertion. The Examiner merely relied on Zhou to allegedly disclose aspects of term frequency and inverse document frequency weighting. (Office Action, pg. 16.) At best, Zhou discloses a method of constructing a confusion set database for use in detecting user query intentions to assist users' writing in a non-native language by proving suggestive sentences to improve the users' writing. (Zhou, Abstract, ¶ [0023].)

Claims 2-21, 23-26, 28-47, 49-52, and 54-56 were rejected over Ryan in view of various combinations of Knight, Ducatel and Zhou for the dependent limitations in the claims. Claims 2-21, 23-26, 28-47, 49-52, and 54-56 depend either directly or indirectly from the patentable independent claims 1, 22, 27, 48 and 53 discussed above. Thus, claims 2-21, 23-26, 28-47, 49-52, and 54-56 are patentable over the cited references by reason of their dependency to claims 1, 22, 27, 48 and 53, in addition to the further patentable limitations recited therein.

For example, amended claim 5 recites "wherein ranking the article identifiers is based at least in part on characteristics of the content of the article, wherein the characteristics comprise meta-data associated with the article content." There is no hint, mention or

suggestion in Ryan of ranking article identifiers based at least in part on "characteristics of the *content of the article*," much less on "meta-data associated with the article content."

Ryan merely discloses that web page listings are tagged to keep track of web pages that are selected by a user. (Ryan, col. 30, lns. 56-67.) The Examiner asserts the web page tags are "meta-data." Assuming for the sake of argument that a web page tag can be considered meta-data, the web page tags are not associated with the "the article content," as claimed. Additionally, even if the web page tags are associated with the content of the web page, the content of the web page is *not* content from the article in which the user had "a user interaction with" during an "event concerning the user's current context" from which a keyword is extracted. In Ryan, the web pages are from a result set based on a user search query. Knight, Ducatel and Zhou do not remedy the deficiencies of Ryan nor does the Examiner make this assertion.

Amended claim 6 recites that "the meta-data comprise at least one of bolding, highlighting, italicizing, font color, or heading data of keywords of the article." In the claimed invention, meta-data such as highlighting of content of the article are used to rank article identifiers. There is no, hint, mention or suggestion in Ryan, Knight, Ducatel or Zhou of the recited feature. The Examiner notes that Ryan discloses that keywords with the most search results are highlighted. However there is no disclosure in Ryan that the highlighting is used to rank article identifiers. Ryan's disclosure of highlighting is used to merely indicate to the user which keywords had the most search results.

Amended claim 10 recites "wherein ranking the article identifiers is based at least in part on characteristics of the content of the article, wherein the characteristics comprise number data associated with the keyword within the article." There is no hint, mention or

suggestion in Ryan, Knight, Ducatel or Zhou of the recited feature. The Examiner alleges that col. 17, lns. 40-45 of Ryan illustrates "number data." However, the section cited by the Examiner merely shows how many times a web page (i.e., the alleged article) was visited by users. (Ryan, col. 17, lns. 31-38 and col. 12, lns. 27-32.) The number of times a web page was visited by users is not "associated with the keyword within the article," as claimed. Furthermore, the web page is not a web page in which the user had "a user interaction with" during an "event concerning the user's current context."

Claim 11 recites "wherein the number data comprises a number of letters in the keyword." There is no hint, mention or suggestion in Ryan, Knight, Ducatel or Zhou of the recited feature. The Examiner alleges that col. 14, lns. 57-67 of Ryan illustrates letters associated with a keyword. However, this is incorrect. The section cited by the Examiner merely indicates the cumulative number of hits a web page has had, the previous cumulative number of hits a web page has had and a date time factor associated with the web page. There is no mention in the section cited by the Examiner that Ryan uses the "number of letters in the keyword" to rank article identifiers.

Conclusion

In sum, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims now pending are patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons given above, while not necessarily conceding any contention not specifically addressed. Applicants request reconsideration of the basis for the rejections of these claims and request allowance of them.

If the Examiner believes that for any reason direct contact with Applicants' attorney would help advance the prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

Respectfully Submitted,
NINIANE WANG ET AL.

Date: November 6, 2008

By: /Brian Hoffman/
Brian M. Hoffman, Attorney of Record
Registration No. 39.713
FENWICK & WEST LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (415) 875-2484
Fax: (650) 938-5200
Email: bhoffman@fenwick.com